

relationship was found. In part, the question will stem from the enormous emphasis on procedure and methodology; these are offered as contributions, at times, in lieu of adequate testing of the intended hypotheses. This, possibly, is a criticism that is more general than the particular studies of this text deserve, since there is little question that they are well selected.

A last point that the reader may find disturbing is, that, in spite of the editors' noble attempts at integration, there are wide gaps between the selections, and one does not have the feeling that the area is well covered. Nevertheless, this text is definitely a major contribution and serves as the best source on group dynamics and small group research currently available.

Aside from classroom use, which might be considerably restricted since effective use will depend quite heavily on the instructor, this collection of readings will be an important item for all persons working in the behavioral sciences. Practitioners at various levels, from group workers to psychiatrists and from personnel managers to top executives, will want to read these materials if they have a genuine interest in understanding behavior, and in finding out the source of some of the ready made generalizations that appear in the sugar-coated literature.

Persons interested in research in substantive areas of investigation, such as the family, population problems, housing, public health administration, and so many others, should take cognizance of the work in this area. While a good deal of the research reported is "purified" in the laboratory, the theoretical ramifications are of importance for those who depend on sociological and psychological theory for the eventual prediction of trends, if not the understanding of them. Many ideas need to be developed in this new flourishing area, but some are already available for the enterprising researchers in other fields.

EDGAR F. BORGATTA

• • •

## FERTILITY AND MORTALITY IN AN INDIAN DISTRICT<sup>1</sup>

**I**N 1951, a Section on Demography and Population Studies was established at the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics

<sup>1</sup> Dandekar, V. M. and Dandekar, Kumudini: SURVEY OF FERTILITY AND MOR-  
(Continued on page 316)

(located in Poona, a city southeast of Bombay, India) for the purpose of expanding the Institute's research program in fertility and mortality. The volume under review is a report of a demographic survey in Poona undertaken during the first year of the existence of this Section.

The main objectives of the survey were to study the socio-economic correlates of fertility and mortality and to investigate attitudes toward family planning and limitation. For purposes of analysis, Poona, which is one of the central districts of the Bombay State with a 1951 population of close to 2 million, was divided into the city of Poona, other urban areas, and the rural sections of the district. The sampling base employed was the biological unit of the family defined relative to the male head. Fortunately, the survey was able to draw on the data of the recent 1951 Census. Three interview schedules were used, one relating to the main investigation into fertility and mortality, and two on male and female attitudes toward family planning.

The survey results for 1,180 families in the city of Poona and 1,006 families in the remainder of the district are relevant mainly for the fertility variable; much of the mortality data, although it provided a basis for the construction of detailed life tables for the area, for various reasons proved inadequate to justify elaborate analysis. The relationship between marital fertility and such variables as age of woman at marriage, duration of marriage, differences between ages of husband and wife, caste, occupation of husband and wife, education, income, etc. was analyzed mainly by the use of the chi square test of significance of differences. For the main part, this statistical analysis showed no significant results, particularly with the socio-economic variables. The authors claim, however, that some semblance of differential fertility is emerging with reference to occupation, caste, and education, but the differences are very small.

Perhaps the most provocative section of this publication is the chapter reporting the results of the survey on attitudes toward family planning. The authors claim that the rapport established between interviewers and respondents on this subject was, in general, quite satisfactory. In the City proper, only 9 per cent of the male heads of families answered affirmatively to the question of whether they

were practicing contraception; in the remainder of the district the corresponding proportion was less than 2 per cent. These results also accurately reflected the proportion ever having practiced contraception. Hardly any of the respondents who reported not having practiced contraception claimed any knowledge of the subject at all, but many claimed that they would welcome information. Significantly, moral and religious objections were voiced by only a small minority of the total group. In regard to the future of contraception in the area, the authors state that "the people are neither hostile nor indifferent—a steady flow of scientific knowledge regarding contraception and provision of facilities within the means of those wishing to adopt it in practice is urgent and will, it appears to us, produce lasting results."

The report is concluded with a presentation of a number of case studies of people's reactions to the subject of birth control. These profiles are quite illuminating of the various psychological points on the acceptance-rejection scale. A common theme that appears to pervade the negative reactions, particularly among the poorer classes, is a kind of fatalistic acceptance of one's station in life. This is an attitude of particular significance in any assessment of the prospects of social change in India.

In general, this work can be considered an important contribution to our demographic knowledge of India and particularly to our rather sparse knowledge of popular attitudes toward family limitation. On the other hand, several minor criticisms can be enumerated. The proof-reading especially could have been better. The authors tend to rely entirely too much on the chi square test in their statistical analysis. Occasional presentation of rates or averages would have facilitated study of the tables. It would also have been helpful had the authors clearly offered their opinions on the representativeness of this study for the Indian population at large—an admittedly risky but inevitable question.

CHARLES F. WESTOFF